

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-25 were presented for examination. Claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-20 and 22-25 were rejected. The Examiner has allowed claims 26-28. Claims 4 and 16 were objected to by the Examiner as being dependent on a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the present amendment, claims 2 and 14 have been amended and claims 4 and 16 canceled. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 2-3, 5-15 and 17-28 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 2, 14 and 26 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 5-15 and 17-28 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103****I. Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22 and 24-25 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neale et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0131079 A1) (“Neale”) in view of Dolson (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0006643) (“Dolson”). Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that Neale and Dolson fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Independent claims 2 and 14 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter identified by the Examiner in claims 4 and 16, respectively, thereby mooting this rejection with respect to these claims. Claims 6, 8 and 12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 2, as amended,

and claims 18, 20, 22 and 24-25 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 14, as amended. Thus, claims 6, 8, 10, 12-13, 18, 20, 22 and 24-25 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

## II. Dependent Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 5, 11, 15, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Neale in view of Dolson and further in view of Dempo (US Patent No. 6,934,288) (“Dempo”). Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Neale in view of Dolson and further in view of Donzis et al. (US Patent No. 6,973,097) (“Donzis”). Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Neale in view of Dolson and further in view of Badt et al. (US Patent No. 5,959,974) (“Badt”). Applicants traverse these rejections and submit that Neale, Dolson, Dempo, Donzis and Badt, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

For the reasons discussed above in connection with amended independent claims 2 and 14, Applicants submit these independent claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 2. Claims 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 14. Neale, Dolson, Dempo, Donzis and Badt, alone or in combination fail to detract from the patentability of these dependent claims. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: January 13, 2009

/Christopher J. McKenna/  
Christopher J. McKenna  
Registration No. 53,302  
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP  
Two International Place  
Boston, MA 02110  
(617) 248-5000 (phone)  
(617) 502-5002 (fax)